

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed August 25, 2003. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-19 remain pending. In particular, Applicant has added claims 16-19 and has amended claims 1, 6 and 11. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable by *Carter*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

With respect to claim one, that claim recites:

1. A method for transparent file proxying, the method comprising:
 - coupling a plurality of computing devices to a local area network, at least one of said plurality of computing devices including an ability to route communication packets to said remaining plurality of computing devices, each of said plurality of computing devices including a memory element containing a plurality of files;
 - coupling said at least one of said plurality of computing devices to a wide area communication network;
 - coupling a remote memory element to said wide area communication network;
 - coupling a remote computing device to said remote memory element, *said remote memory element configured to maintain a copy of a first file selected from said plurality of files contained in the memory elements of said plurality of computing devices if a first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the first file*;
 - intercepting, in said remote memory element, an Internet Protocol (IP) communication message from said remote computing device, *said IP communication message corresponding to a request from the first user to access said first file*; and
 - providing said copy of said first file to said remote computing device* when said remote memory element intercepts said IP communication message from said remote computing

device if said IP communication message requests said first file from one of said plurality of computing devices connected to said local area network, *thus providing said copy of said first file to said remote computing device without said IP communication message traversing said wide area communication network and said local area network.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Carter* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Carter* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating at least “said remote memory element configured to maintain a copy of a first file selected from said plurality of files contained in the memory elements of said plurality of computing devices if a first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the first file.” Because *Carter* does not teach or reasonably suggest at least this feature/limitation, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, since claims 2-5 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

With the respect to claim 6, that claim recites:

6. A system for transparent file proxying, comprising:
 - a local network to which is coupled a plurality of computing devices, at least one of said plurality of computing devices including the ability to route communication packets to said remaining plurality of computing devices, each of said plurality of computing devices including a memory element containing a plurality of files;
 - a communication network coupled to said at least one of said plurality of computing devices;
 - a remote memory element coupled to said communication network;
 - a remote computing device connected to said remote memory element, said remote memory element configured to intercept an Internet Protocol (IP) communication message from said remote computing device, *said remote memory element configured to maintain a copy of a first file selected from said plurality of files contained in the memory elements of said plurality of computing devices if a first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the first file;* and

wherein said remote memory element is configured to provide said the copy of the first file to said remote computing device when said remote memory element intercepts said IP communication message from said remote computing device, said IP communication message corresponding to a request from the first user to access said first file from one of said plurality of computing devices connected to said local network, thus providing said copy of the first file to said remote computing device without said IP communication message traversing said communication network and said local area network.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Carter* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 6. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Carter* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating at least "said remote memory element configured to maintain a copy of a first file selected from said plurality of files contained in the memory elements of said plurality of computing devices if a first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the first file." Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 6 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 7-10 incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 6, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 11, that claim recites:

11. A computer readable medium having a program for transparent file proxying, the program comprising logic configured to perform the steps of:

coupling a plurality of computing devices to a local area network, at least one of said plurality of computing devices including an ability to route communication packets to said remaining plurality of computing devices, each of said plurality of computing devices including a memory element containing a plurality of files;

coupling said at least one of said plurality of computing devices to a wide area communication network;

coupling a remote memory element to said wide area communication network;

coupling a remote computing device to *said remote memory element, said remote memory element configured to maintain a copy of a first file selected from said plurality of files contained in the memory elements of said plurality of computing*

devices if a first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the first file;

intercepting, in said remote memory element, an Internet Protocol (IP) communication message from said remote computing device, *said IP communication message corresponding to a request from the first user to access said first file;* and

providing said copy of said first file to said remote computing device when said remote memory element intercepts said IP communication message from said remote computing device if said IP communication message requests said first file from one of said plurality of computing devices connected to said local area network, *thus providing said copy of said first file to said remote computing device without said IP communication message traversing said wide area communication network and said local area network.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that *Carter* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 11. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Carter* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating at least “said remote memory element configured to maintain a copy of a first file selected from said plurality of files contained in the memory elements of said plurality of computing devices if a first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the first file.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 12-15 incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 11, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Newly-Added Claims

Upon entry of the amendments in this Response, Applicant has added new claims 16-19, and respectfully asserts that these claims are in condition for allowance. Specifically, claim 16 recites:

16. A computer-implemented method for providing a file to a remote computing device operated by a first user, the file being stored within a local area network, the remote computing device communicating with the local area network via a communication link provided by a wide area network, said method comprising:

storing a copy of the file within the wide area network if the first user of the remote computing device is authorized access to the file such that a copy of the file is not stored within the wide area network if the first user is not authorized access to the file;

intercepting, within the wide area network, an Internet Protocol (IP) communication message from the remote computing device, the IP communication message corresponding to a request from the first user to access the file stored within the local area network; and

providing the copy of the file to the remote computing device without allowing the IP communication message to be provided to the local area network.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited art of record does not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 16. Applicant respectfully asserts, therefore, that claim 16 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 17-19 are dependent claims incorporate all the features/limitations recited in claim 16, Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Paul Qualey, Jr., Reg. No. 43, 024

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
100 Galleria Parkway N.W., Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 10/21/03.

Stephanie Riley
Signature